

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,503	09/28/2004	Tamaki Homma	70009	4010
26748 7	590 06/27/2006		EXAMINER	
SYNGENTA CROP PROTECTION , INC. PATENT AND TRADEMARK DEPARTMENT			CLARDY, S	
	410 SWING ROAD GREENSBORO, NC 27409		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
GREENSBOR			1617	

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summany	10/509,503	HOMMA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	S. Mark Clardy	1617			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION B6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 Se	<u>eptember 2004</u> .				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the construction of the constructi	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) △ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/28/2004.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa				

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application which has been filed under 35 USC 371 as the national stage of international application PCT/US03/09441, filed March 27, 2003.

Applicants' claims are drawn to methods of inhibiting the formation of Coniferophyta pollen by applying prohexadione, or a related compound, to the Coniferophyta plant.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 1 is drawn to a method of inhibiting the formation of pollen; however, from the disclosure, it would appear that a more appropriate description would be a method of reducing the formation of pollen. An absolute, total inhibition of pollen formation does not appear to be enabled. Further, the method comprises applying a "...pollinosis inhibiting effective amount of a composition...". While pollinosis in a bystander may in fact be reduced, it is doubtful that it would be completely and totally absent (i.e., inhibited). It would appear that a more appropriate description would be to refer to a "pollen reducing amount of a composition", and leave the innocent, sniffling bystander out of it.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

⁽a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Bakholdina (SU 1005724), Chaudhury¹, and Nakaseko et al (US 5,665,680).

Bakholdina teaches that application of gibberellin (GA) to pine trees stimulates the production of pollen.

Chaudhury teaches that application of GA to plants with genetic male sterility will restore pollen function, indicating that GA plays a role in stamen (and pollen) development (p. 1278, last paragraph).

Nakaseko et al teach the application of a GA biosynthesis inhibiting compound to soybeans (col 1, lines 36-43), an example of which is prohexadione (col 3, line 9).

One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine these references in order to control pollen production in a plant because they disclose the role of GA in stimulating pollen production, and suggest the means of accomplishing the reverse by interfering with the GA stimulating effect.

Thus it would have been *prima facie* obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to have applied prohexadione to conifer plants to inhibit pollen production because GA was a known plant hormone which stimulates the production of pollen, and that reduction or elimination of GA will result in reduced or eliminated pollen (i.e., male sterility). Nakaseko et al disclose that prohexadione interferes with GA biosynthesis, thus the ordinary artisan would expect that prohexadione application, at or before the time of pollen production, will interfere with, or inhibit, its production.

¹ Chaudhury, Abdul M. "Nuclear Genes Controlling Male Fertility" *The Plant Cell.* 5:1277-1283. 1983.

Art Unit: 1617

No unobvious or unexpected results are noted; no claim is allowed.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Mark Clardy whose telephone number is 571-272-0611. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

S. Mark Clardy Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1617

June 22, 2006